

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
3

4 Jamal Damon Hendrix,
5 Plaintiff
6 v.
7 Rohan, C/O, et al.,
8 Defendants
9

2:13-cv-01527-JAD-CWH
Order Granting Motion to Extend Time
[ECF No. 132]

10 Plaintiff Jamal Hendrix moves for a 45–50-day extension of his July 21, 2017, deadline to
11 respond to the defendants’ supplemental brief on the issue of whether his claims are subject to
12 further tolling as suggested by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Hendrix does not explain why
13 he needs additional time (and, in fact, it appears he erroneously believes his deadline was July
14 10th, not July 21st), though the local rule for requesting additional time (LR IA 6-1(a)) requires
15 the motion to “state the reasons for the extension requested” so that the court can evaluate
16 whether good cause for the extension exists.

17 I deny Hendrix’s motion for a 45–50 day extension of time because he has not
18 demonstrated good cause for it. But since Hendrix is apparently confused about the deadline, I
19 will *sua sponte* grant a short extension, making his brief due August 4, 2017. If Hendrix believes
20 that he requires more time than that, he will need to file a new motion to extend this August 4,
21 2017, deadline, which must “state the reasons for the extension requested and must inform the
22 court of all previous extensions of the subject deadline the court granted.” LR IA 6-1(a).

23 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Hendrix’s motion to extend the time for
24 his supplemental brief regarding tolling [ECF No. 132] is **DENIED**; the court will nevertheless
25 **extend the deadline briefly because it appears that Hendrix is confused about the actual**
26 **deadline. Hendrix has until August 4, 2017, to file his response brief** regarding tolling.

27 DATED: July 14, 2017.

28 
Jennifer A. Dorsey
United States District Judge